

And the bill that is being proposed by the Democrats is still about 2,500 pages long and still contains the worst parts of the old bill.

So what is in the new one?

Well, here are a couple of things. It still supersedes the IRS. This new bill would still give the Internal Revenue Service \$80 billion to hire an army of IRS agents. Now, Democrats know this is unpopular, yet they continue to defend the proposal.

Why would that be?

The American people have spoken out. They complained to Congress. Democrats don't seem to care. That is because Democrats need to squeeze working Americans for more of the hard-earned money they make.

Why do they want it?

So the Democrats can spend it.

What do they want to spend it on?

Well, the largest part of this bill has to do with energy. It would spend half a trillion dollars for parts of the Green New Deal. That includes over \$2.5 billion for something they call tree equity.

It still includes enormous handouts to people who buy electric luxury vehicles. Now, we already give billions and billions of taxpayer dollars in subsidy to electric vehicle makers and owners. This would be even more.

Studies show 80 percent of these subsidies go to households making more than \$100,000 each. Well, Democrats say that is not enough. This bill still would give \$12,500 to couples making up to \$800,000 a year to buy luxury electric vehicles.

The bill still includes the \$1,500 payouts to people who buy electric bicycles. It is a mystery to me how electric bicycles can be better for the environment than regular bicycles. They are obviously not. It just shows that this policy is really not about the environment; it is about payoffs to Democrat elites in the big cities.

That is why the bill still includes the Civilian Climate Corps. Now, this is an army of full-time, taxpayer-funded climate activists. They would get paid generous stipends and salaries. And what would they get paid to do? To protest American energy projects.

Now, just last week, climate protesters stopped traffic in New York City during rush hour. People were just trying to get to work or get home, just trying to take their kids to school, yet they had to sit in traffic because of professional protesters, and this administration wants to hire up to a million of them.

Now, Democrats know this isn't popular. That is why they changed the name of the Climate Corps in the new bill. They didn't change the purpose. Now they are trying to call it the Land Corps. It sounds like a harmless group. It is the same civilian climate army, a green army to attack American oil, gas, and coal.

Now, this name change alone is an admission that this idea is very unpopular. Democrats know the Amer-

ican people don't want to spend billions of dollars to subsidize protesters.

A recent poll found 90 percent of Americans are unwilling to pay more than \$100 a year to fight climate change. We are already paying more than \$1,000 a year in energy costs to drive and to heat our homes due to Joe Biden's energy policies. This is \$1,000 more than we did last year.

At home this past weekend in Wyoming, I noted and talked to folks while I was filling up that gas is a dollar a gallon higher than it was when Joe Biden took office. Natural gas prices have doubled, and that means a lot because half of the families in America use natural gas to power their homes.

This bill also increases taxes on American energy production. Democrats specifically target a new tax on natural gas production. So this would raise taxes and prices significantly—even higher—for American families who already this winter are facing a 7-year high in the cost of natural gas and are already trying to decide this winter are they going to be able to heat or to eat. That is becoming a concern of families all across America under Joe Biden's agenda and economy.

One in five American families have already cut their spending to pay for their energy bills this year. The American public and people are paying too much for Joe Biden's energy agenda. They don't want to pay a penny more. They are tired of it, fed up.

Democrats know their agenda is unpopular with the American public. That is why this bill would also permanently change the makeup of the country, because the new version of the bill would give amnesty for millions upon millions of illegal immigrants. The Parliamentarian has said Democrats couldn't pass amnesty in the last version of the bill, yet Democrats want amnesty so badly they are going to try it all over again. Apparently, version C is coming soon.

This is supposed to be a spending bill, not an immigration bill. If they want to do an immigration bill, they ought to introduce an immigration bill. Yet Democrats know that they don't have the votes to pass the kind of immigration bill that they want to pass—not at a time when we have a flood of illegal immigrants coming across the southern border, with more on the way.

So they are trying to cram it into this spending bill. They are hoping that the American public won't notice. If Democrats have their way, this would be the most consequential immigration bill in half a century. The bill would give millions of illegal immigrants amnesty and then give them plenty of taxpayer money because this bill includes new permanent welfare programs with no work requirements—none at all—and no citizenship requirements. That is what the Democrats are proposing.

It is no wonder that we have a border crisis at our southern border, a flood of illegal immigrants. With this bill,

Democrats are promising amnesty, as well as free childcare, free preschool, and even free college to illegal immigrants. This is in addition to the \$300 checks they already sent to illegal immigrants with the spending bill that the Democrats passed along party-line votes in March.

Democrats seem to do everything that they can to reward illegal immigration. The Wall Street Journal reports the Biden administration now wants to give millions of dollars to families who came here illegally in 2018 and were detained for illegal entry. The number being reported is that the Biden administration wants to give them \$450,000 a person.

Now, this is more than six times the annual income of a typical American family, Mr. President. It is more than 50 times the per-capita income of El Salvador. \$450,000 per person will mean millions upon millions of taxpayer dollars for families who came here illegally. You talk about an incentive for people to come here illegally—this is exhibit A. The total payout could be more than a billion dollars.

Now, let me just contrast that number of \$450,000 with the fact that those who lose their lives defending the country, like a marine—a young marine from Wyoming, Rylee McCollum, who was one of the 13 killed in Kabul, Afghanistan—the United States sends to those families \$100,000, and Joe Biden is promising 4½ times that much for people who came here illegally.

Mr. President, the Democrats say this is a new bill. It is the same old Democrat agenda: high energy costs, amnesty for illegal immigrants, welfare and payoffs to wealthy donors.

And this is the bill endorsed by the President of the United States. It is no wonder that 71 percent of Americans this past weekend said this country is heading in the wrong direction. It is the wrong direction under the Democrats and under Joe Biden.

Democrats ought to listen to the American people. People are furious with this administration. Listen to the sirens blaring with the poor economic numbers reported last week. It is time to stop making the Biden economy even worse. It is time to stop the freefall. Stop this reckless tax and spending before the administration does even further damage to our economy and our country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, last week, I was on the floor expressing my concern about things that I heard while home, and the odd thing seemed to be that they were things that I would never expect to be true. And

often that has been the case over the years. You hear something from a constituent or read in the paper or see on the internet, and it is like, this can't be true.

And the one that stands out to me this week is this intention by the Departments of Justice, Homeland Security, and Health and Human Services to pay up to \$450,000 per person of families who illegally crossed our border and were detained separately.

This is an absurd policy decision. It gives greater incentives for people to come to the United States and make that dangerous trek to our border. How can it be fair to our law-abiding American citizens?

This is a situation that makes no sense to me. And it is something that the Biden administration ought to immediately reject as out of bounds for commonsense and good judgment and, certainly, something that is damaging to the ability for us to have a lawful, sovereign border, and something that is very damaging to the citizens of this country but also to those who make the humanitarian challenge of traveling through Central America and Mexico to our sponsor border.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

VOTE ON DAVIDSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Davidson nomination.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Davidson nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 456 Ex.]

YEAS—88

Baldwin	Daines	King
Barrasso	Duckworth	Klobuchar
Bennet	Durbin	Lankford
Blumenthal	Ernst	Leahy
Blunt	Feinstein	Lee
Booker	Fischer	Lujan
Boozman	Gillibrand	Lummis
Brown	Graham	Manchin
Burr	Grassley	Markey
Cantwell	Hagerty	McConnell
Capito	Hassan	Menendez
Cardin	Heinrich	Merkley
Carper	Hickenlooper	Moran
Casey	Hirono	Murkowski
Cassidy	Hoeven	Murphy
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Murray
Coons	Inhofe	Ossoff
Cornyn	Johnson	Padilla
Cortez Masto	Kaine	Paul
Cramer	Kelly	Peters
Crapo	Kennedy	Portman

Reed	Shaheen	Warner
Risch	Sinema	Warnock
Romney	Smith	Warren
Rosen	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Sanders	Sullivan	Wicker
Sasse	Tester	Wyden
Schatz	Thune	Young
Schumer	Toomey	
Scott (SC)	Van Hollen	

NAYS—10

Blackburn	Hawley	Shelby
Braun	Marshall	Tuberville
Cotton	Rubio	
Cruz	Scott (FL)	

NOT VOTING—2

Rounds Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Harris nomination.

The Senator from North Carolina.

REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE—S. 1364

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 50, S. 1364, the Lumbee Tribe of the North Carolina Recognition Act, be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Jersey.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to seek unanimous consent for eight to nine nominees to critical State Department posts.

Each of them moved through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with bipartisan support, and the only reason the Senate has not confirmed them is due to the political obstinacy of a couple of my Republican colleagues. And the evidence of that is that when we have a vote, as we had earlier today for the Assistant Administrator of AID, it passed 59 to 40—59 to 40.

We have heard many complaints about the management of the State Department and the conduct of U.S. foreign policy in recent months. And while the State Department is not a perfect institution—for that fact, no institution is—its leadership was decimated by the prior administration.

The assistant secretaries and ambassadors who should be participating in the rebuilding of the institution and the development and implementation of U.S. foreign policy are instead languishing on the Senate floor—dozens, dozens.

Nominees who should be the face of the United States at international organizations—like the United Nations, NATO, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe—are in-

stead waiting for the Senate to act. The government of the People's Republic of China is watching. Even though the majority of this body has recognized that the Government of China represents the greatest geopolitical challenge to the United States, we are letting China eat our lunch on the world stage.

Our Republican colleagues have spoken at length in opposition to this administration's handling of the situation in Afghanistan, but they refuse to allow the Senate to vote on nominees who are critical to dealing with the refugee situation resulting from the U.S. withdrawal and the much-needed stabilization efforts.

By the way, a withdrawal that was already precooked by the Trump administration when it made a surrender deal with the Taliban that said we will leave on a date certain, we will release thousands of Taliban prisoners—which they did, to the Taliban, who became fighting soldiers—we ultimately will not only leave at a date certain, but we have done nothing to get any of the promises that the Taliban made enforced, and we reduce our troop level dramatically. That is what President Biden inherited.

Now, I have heard a lot about the handling of the situation in Afghanistan, but my colleagues refuse to allow the Senate to vote on nominees who are critical to dealing with the refugee situation resulting from that withdrawal and the much-needed stabilization efforts.

Nominees being held by the Republicans include the Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees, and Migration; and the Assistant Secretary for Conflict and Stabilization Operations. That cannot stand.

And for all the talk of needing to work with our allies and partners, how does holding our nominee to be the U.S. Ambassador to Israel or the U.S. Ambassador to Canada actually advance U.S. interests?

It does not. It is seriously detrimental to our national security.

Before I ask unanimous consent, I understand Senator SCHUMER would like to speak prior to these UC requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, thank you. I have some brief remarks, and I want to thank my friend, the Senator from New Jersey, who will move in a few moments to have this Chamber approve a number of critical nominees for our national security and is going to be, shamefully, blocked.

He has been a great fighter not only for these men and women, but on foreign policy in general, one of the great leaders. And his passion for this issue comes from a desire to have us have the greatest strength abroad diplomatically and geopolitically as well. So I cannot thank him enough.

Mr. President, of all the mandates of the government, the most important is